1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 1 EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA 2 ALEXANDRIA DIVISION 3 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,) Case 1:24-cr-141 4 Plaintiff, 5 Alexandria, Virginia v. June 21, 2024 ROBERT WESLEY ROBB, 2:33 p.m. 6 7 Defendant. Pages 1 - 46 8 9 TRANSCRIPT OF PLEA HEARING AND 10 MOTION TO RELEASE FROM CUSTODY AFTER ENTRY OF PLEA 11 BEFORE THE HONORABLE ANTHONY J. TRENGA 12 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE 13 APPEARANCES: 14 FOR THE PLAINTIFF: 15 KATHERINE E. RUMBAUGH, ESQUIRE 16 A. ZOE BEDELL, ESQUIRE OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY 17 2100 Jamieson Avenue Alexandria, Virginia 22314 18 (703) 299-370019 FOR THE DEFENDANT: 20 ANN MASON RIGBY, ESQUIRE OFFICE OF THE FEDERAL PUBLIC DEFENDER 1650 King Street, Suite 500 21 Alexandria, Virginia 22314 22 (703) 600-080023 THE DEFENDANT, ROBERT WESLEY ROBB, IN PERSON 2.4 25 COMPUTERIZED TRANSCRIPTION OF STENOGRAPHIC NOTES

Rhonda F. Montgomery OCR-USDC/EDVA (703) 299-4599

(703) 299-4599

```
1
                    PROCEEDINGS
2
             THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: Criminal Case
3
   No. 1:24-cr-141, United States v. Robert Wesley Robb.
4
             Counsel, will you please note your
5
   appearances for the record.
6
             MS. BEDELL: Good afternoon, Your Honor.
7
   It's Zoe Bedell and Katherine Rumbaugh for the United
  ||States.
8
9
             THE COURT: Good afternoon.
10
             MS. RIGBY: Good afternoon, Your Honor.
                                                      Ann
11
  Mason Rigby on behalf of Mr. Robb, who is present.
12
             THE COURT: All right. I understand we're
13
  here for a pre-indictment plea based on a plea
14
  agreement and statement of facts and also Mr. Robb's
15
  motion for release pending sentencing.
16
             MS. RIGBY: Yes, Your Honor, that's correct.
17
             THE COURT: All right. Mr. Robb, would you
18
   come to the podium and be sworn, please.
19
        (The defendant affirms.)
20
             THE COURT: Would you state your full name,
21
  Hplease.
22
             THE DEFENDANT: Robert Wesley Robb.
23
             THE COURT: Mr. Robb, the purpose of this
  hearing is to give you the opportunity to enter a
25
  guilty plea to the charge of wire fraud.
                                             If you enter
```

```
\parallelsuch a plea, it will be the responsibility of this
   Court to ensure that your plea is being entered
  voluntarily, that is, that no one is forcing you to
   enter that plea against your will and that your plea is
4
5
  Inot being entered in exchange for any promises or
6
  agreements except those in your plea agreement.
7
             The Court also has the responsibility to
  ensure that your plea is entered knowingly, that is,
8
9
   that you understand the consequences of pleading
10
  guilty.
11
             In order for the Court to make those
12
  determinations, I'm going to ask you a series of
13
   questions. And for that purpose, you've been placed
14
  under oath. Having been placed under oath, you have
15
  the obligation to answer all of the Court's questions
16
  truthfully. If any of your answers prove to be untrue,
17
  lyou may be subjecting yourself to additional criminal
18
  penalties, including those for perjury based on the
19
  responses you give here in court today.
20
             Do you understand that?
21
             THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.
22
             THE COURT: What is your age?
23
             THE DEFENDANT:
                             Forty-six.
2.4
                         And what is your highest level of
             THE COURT:
25
   formal education?
```

(703) 299-4599

```
1
             THE DEFENDANT: Some college.
 2
             THE COURT: You read, write, and understand
3
   the English language?
 4
             THE DEFENDANT:
                              Yes.
5
             THE COURT: And you're a citizen of the
   United States?
6
7
             THE DEFENDANT:
                              Yes.
8
             THE COURT: And you've been represented by a
9
   lawyer in connection with this charge; is that correct?
10
             THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
11
             THE COURT: Have you met with your lawyer?
12
             THE DEFENDANT:
                              I have.
13
             THE COURT: Has your lawyer explained to you
14
  the charge against you and what the government must
15
  prove in order to convict you of that charge?
16
             THE DEFENDANT:
                              Yes, Your Honor.
17
             THE COURT: Has your lawyer explained to you
18
   the consequences of pleading guilty?
19
             THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
20
             THE COURT: Have you provided to your lawyer
21
   all the facts and information you know that may relate
22
  to this charge?
23
             THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
2.4
             THE COURT: And have you discussed with your
25
  lawyer any possible defenses you might have and what
```

```
would be required to prove those defenses?
 1
 2
             THE DEFENDANT:
                              Yes.
 3
             THE COURT: Have you understood everything
 4
   your lawyer has told you?
 5
             THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
 6
             THE COURT: Have you had all your questions
 7
   answered to your satisfaction?
 8
             THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.
 9
             THE COURT: Have you had any difficulty
10
  understanding anything your lawyer has told you,
11
   anything about the charge against you, or anything
12
  about the nature of these proceedings, including why
13
   you're in court here today?
14
             THE DEFENDANT: No.
15
             THE COURT: Have you been satisfied with the
16
  services of your lawyer?
17
             THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
18
             THE COURT: Do you think you've had enough
19
  \paralleltime to meet with your lawyer and discuss whether or
20
  not you should be entering a guilty plea at this point
21
  in the proceedings?
22
             THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
23
             THE COURT: Have you been under the influence
  of any drugs or medication or any other substance
25
   that's affected your ability to understand anything
```

Rhonda F. Montgomery OCR-USDC/EDVA (703) 299-4599

(703) 299-4599

```
your lawyer has told you, anything about the charge
1
2
   against you, or anything about these proceedings?
3
              THE DEFENDANT:
                              No.
 4
              THE COURT: Ms. Rigby, based on everything
5
   you know, is Mr. Robb competent to enter a guilty plea
  here today?
6
7
              MS. RIGBY:
                          Yes.
                          Do you understand that the charge
8
              THE COURT:
9
   to which you would plead guilty is wire fraud?
10
              THE DEFENDANT:
                              Yes.
11
              THE COURT: And do you understand that by
12
  \parallelpleading guilty, you will be convicted of that charge
13
   just as if you had gone to trial on a plea of not
14
   guilty and were convicted by a jury?
15
              THE DEFENDANT:
                              Yes.
16
              THE COURT: Has your lawyer explained to you
17
  the maximum punishment you could receive based on the
18
   conviction that would result from your quilty plea?
19
              THE DEFENDANT:
                              Yes.
20
              THE COURT: The maximum punishment you could
21
  \parallelreceive is a term of imprisonment of up to 20 years, a
22
   fine of up to $250,000, forfeiture of any
   offense-related assets, restitution with respect to any
23
2.4
  \parallelvictim losses, a special assessment of $100 that will
25
  be imposed, and a period of supervised release of at
```

(703) 299-4599

```
\parallelleast 3 years. Do you understand that's the maximum
1
2
   punishment you could receive?
3
              THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.
 4
              THE COURT: I've mentioned supervised release
5
   as a possible term of a sentence. Supervised release,
   if imposed, will begin after you've completed any term
6
7
  \parallelof imprisonment. It would have certain conditions that
  lyou would have to satisfy. And if you failed to
9
  \parallelsatisfy those conditions, you could be imprisoned for
10
  \parallelall or a portion of your period of supervised release
11
   even if you had successfully completed a portion of it.
12
  Do you understand the nature of supervised release?
13
              THE DEFENDANT:
                              Yes.
14
              THE COURT: Also, we've abolished parole
15
  \parallelwithin the federal system. So you will, in fact, serve
  ∥the full length of any term of imprisonment subject
17
  \parallelonly to a reduction of up to 15 percent based on good
18
   behavior. Do you understand that?
19
              THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.
20
              THE COURT: I understand that you have
21
   entered into a written plea agreement.
22
   correct?
23
              THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
2.4
              THE COURT: Do you have that document in
25
  front of you?
```

```
1
             THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
 2
             THE COURT: Does your signature appear on
 3
   that document?
 4
             THE DEFENDANT:
                              It does.
 5
             THE COURT: And you signed that document?
             THE DEFENDANT:
 6
                              I did.
 7
             THE COURT: Did you read that document?
 8
             THE DEFENDANT:
                              Yes.
 9
             THE COURT: Did you have all your questions
10
   answered to your satisfaction about that document?
11
             THE DEFENDANT:
                             Yes.
12
             THE COURT: Did you understand everything in
   that document?
13
14
             THE DEFENDANT: I did.
15
             THE COURT: Did anyone threaten you or try to
16
   influence you in any way into signing that written plea
17
  agreement against your will?
18
             THE DEFENDANT: No, Your Honor.
19
             THE COURT: Is this written plea agreement
20
   the entire agreement you think you have with the United
21
  States government?
22
             THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
23
             THE COURT: Do you think you have any other
2.4
  promises, agreements, or understandings in exchange for
25
  your guilty plea that's not in this written plea
```

Rhonda F. Montgomery OCR-USDC/EDVA (703) 299-4599

(703) 299-4599

```
agreement?
1
2
             THE DEFENDANT:
                              No.
 3
             THE COURT: If you were to go to trial and if
4
   after that trial you were convicted, you would have the
5
  \parallelright to appeal that conviction and any sentence to a
  higher court. Under this plea agreement, you waive,
6
7
  \parallelthat is, you give up your right of appeal both as to
  \parallelthe conviction that would result from your guilty plea,
  🛮 as well as any sentence imposed. Do you understand
10
   that you've waived your right of appeal under this plea
11
   agreement?
12
             THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.
13
             THE COURT: Have you discussed with your
14
  lawyer whether or not you should waive your right of
15
  appeal?
16
             THE DEFENDANT:
             THE COURT: Also, under this plea agreement,
17
18
   the government agrees to make certain recommendations.
19
  Those are only recommendations. They're not binding on
20
   the Court. Only the Court will decide what sentence to
21
   impose in this case. Do you understand that?
22
             THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
23
             THE COURT: Also, under this plea agreement,
  you agree to the entry of a restitution order with
25
  respect to any victim losses. Do you understand that?
```

```
THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
1
 2
              THE COURT: Do you also understand that
3
  you've agreed to the entry of a forfeiture order with
   respect to any offense-related assets and to have that
4
5
   forfeiture order entered without any constitutional or
6
   procedural protections? Do you understand that?
7
              THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
8
              THE COURT: Have you discussed with your
9
  \parallellawyer the rights you have as somebody charged with a
10
  \parallelcrime and that you would give up these rights by
11
  pleading guilty?
12
              THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.
13
              THE COURT: You have the absolute right to
14
  \parallelproceed to a trial on a plea of not guilty before a
15
   jury of 12 United States citizens. Do you understand
   that?
16
17
              THE DEFENDANT:
                              Yes.
18
              THE COURT: In order to convict you of this
19
   charge, that jury must unanimously find you guilty.
20
  you understand?
21
              THE DEFENDANT:
                              Yes.
22
              THE COURT: You have a right to be
23
  ∥represented by a lawyer at that trial and at every
2.4
  \parallelother stage of the proceedings. If you could not
25
   afford one, one would be appointed for you.
```

```
understand that?
1
2
             THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.
 3
             THE COURT: Also, you have the right during
4
   trial to confront any witnesses that the government may
5
   present and to challenge the admissibility of any
   evidence the government may offer. Do you understand
6
   that?
7
8
             THE DEFENDANT:
                              Yes.
9
             THE COURT: You also have the right to
10
  \parallelpresent your own defense. That would include the right
11
  Ito require any person with relevant information to be
  brought into trial and testify and to bring with him or
13
  her any documents relevant to this charge. Do you
14
  understand that?
15
             THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
16
             THE COURT: You also have the right, as part
17
  \parallelof your defense, to testify yourself. You could take
18
   that witness stand, be placed under oath, and testify
19
  subject to cross-examination. You would have
20
   absolutely no obligation to testify. You could remain
21
  \parallelsilent in the face of this charge, and if you decided
22
  not to testify, the government could not force you to
23
  ∥testify or to incriminate yourself in any way. Do you
2.4
  understand that?
25
             THE DEFENDANT:
```

```
THE COURT: Also, if you made the decision
1
  Inot to testify, no inference of quilt could be inferred
3
  \parallelfrom the fact that you decided not to testify.
   would continue to be presumed innocent of this charge,
4
5
   and the government would continue to have the
6
   obligation of proving each and every element of this
7
   charge beyond a reasonable doubt. Do you understand
  #that?
8
9
             THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.
10
              THE COURT: As I mentioned earlier, if after
11
   that trial you were convicted, you would have the right
12
  ∥to appeal that conviction and any sentence to a higher
13
   court. Do you understand that?
14
              THE DEFENDANT:
                              Yes.
15
              THE COURT: By pleading guilty, there will be
16
  \parallelno trial in this case, and all that would be left for
17
   the Court to do would be to decide what sentence to
18
   impose. Do you understand that?
19
             THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
20
             THE COURT: Having heard all of these rights
21
  \parallelthat you have and that you would give up all of these
22
   rights by pleading guilty, is it still your decision to
23
   enter a guilty plea here today?
2.4
              THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.
25
                          In addition to all of these
              THE COURT:
```

```
\parallelrights you will be giving up, there will be other
   collateral consequences of your pleading guilty,
  \parallelincluding the forfeiture of any right you might have to
   vote, hold public office, serve on a jury, or possess a
4
5
   lfirearm.
             Do you understand that?
              THE DEFENDANT:
6
                               Yes.
7
              THE COURT: You also have one other very
  \parallelvaluable constitutional right, and that is the right to
8
9
  have this charge brought against you by way of what we
10
  \parallelcall an indictment, which is issued by what we call a
11
  |||grand jury.
12
              A grand jury consists of up to 23 United
  States citizens.
13
                      In order to issue an indictment, at
14
  least 16 members of that grand jury must meet, hear
15
  evidence from the government, and at least 12 members
  \parallelof that grand jury must decide there's probable cause
17
  to believe you committed this crime.
18
              That grand jury, after hearing the
19
  government's evidence, may issue an indictment, but
20
   it's possible they would decide not to issue an
21
   indictment. And if they decided not to issue an
22
   indictment, the government could not bring this charge
23
   against you.
2.4
              Do you understand that?
25
              THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.
```

```
1
              THE COURT: You have the absolute right to
   insist on an indictment. You also have the right to
  \parallelwaive an indictment and allow the government to
   proceed, as they are doing here today, by way of what
 4
 5
   we call a criminal information.
 6
             A criminal information is not an indictment.
 7
  \parallelIt's simply a piece of paper that was prepared in the
  U.S. Attorney's Office listing this offense. No grand
 8
   jury has heard evidence. No grand jury has made any
 9
10
  probable cause finding.
11
             Have you discussed with your lawyer whether
12
  ∥or not you should waive a grand jury in this case?
13
              THE DEFENDANT:
                              Yes.
14
             THE COURT: And have you decided to waive
15
   indictment in this case?
16
              THE DEFENDANT:
                              Yes.
17
              THE COURT: Have you signed a waiver of
18
   indictment form?
19
             THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.
20
             THE COURT: Do you have that document in
21
  Ifront of you?
22
             THE DEFENDANT:
                              I do.
23
             THE COURT: Your signature appears on that
  document, and you signed that document; is that
25
   correct?
```

(703) 299-4599

```
1
              THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.
 2
             THE COURT: Did you read, understand, and
3
   have all your questions answered about that document?
 4
              THE DEFENDANT:
                              Yes.
5
              THE COURT: Did anyone threaten you or try to
6
   influence you in any way into signing that waiver
7
   against your will?
8
             THE DEFENDANT:
9
              THE COURT: Counsel, based on everything you
   know, is Mr. Robb competent to waive a grand jury in
10
11
   this case?
             MS. RIGBY: Yes, Your Honor.
12
13
              THE COURT: Let the record reflect that based
14
  on the responses of this defendant and the
15
  representations of counsel for the defendant, the Court
  \parallelfinds and concludes that the defendant is competent to
17
  \parallelwaive a grand jury and that he has knowingly and
18
  voluntarily done so.
19
             Have you discussed with your lawyer how the
20
   Court will go about deciding what sentence to impose in
21
   this case?
22
             THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
23
              THE COURT: Have you discussed what we call
  Ithe sentencing guidelines and how they pertain to you
25
   and your offense?
```

THE DEFENDANT: We have.

THE COURT: As that name suggests, those are only guidelines. They're not binding on the Court.

The Court may impose a guideline sentence, or it may impose a sentence greater than the guidelines or less than the guidelines obligated only to impose a sentence within the maximum punishments that I've described to you. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Also, the Court is not going to be able to finally decide what the guideline sentence is until after it receives a presentence report, that you and your lawyer and the government has had an opportunity to review and object to any information in that report. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: In addition to the guidelines, the Court is going to consider a whole range of other factors, including the nature and seriousness of this offense, your own personal history and characteristics, and generally what sentence will be sufficient but no more than necessary to constitute a just punishment and to protect the public. Do you understand those are the kinds of considerations the Court is going to take into account?

(703) 299-4599

1 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. 2 THE COURT: Also, as I mentioned earlier, the 3 Court is not going to be bound by any recommendations. 4 So if you receive a sentence that is different than 5 what the government recommends or that your lawyer recommends or if you receive a sentence that is 6 7 different than someone told you you're likely to \parallel receive or that you're expecting or if you receive a 9 sentence that you just think is unfair in some way, you 10 \parallel nevertheless are going to be bound by your guilty plea, 11 |and you will not be permitted to withdraw your guilty 12 plea after you hear what the sentence is. Do you understand that? 13 14 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor. 15 In a moment, I'm going to ask the THE COURT: 16 government to tell the Court what evidence it would 17 \parallel present against you if this case were to go to trial. 18 \parallel I want you to listen very carefully to what the 19 government tells the Court. Because when the 20 government is done, I'm going to ask you whether you 21 disagree with anything the government has told the 22 Court about your conduct. 23 Have a seat for a moment. We'll hear from 2.4 the government. 25 MS. BEDELL: Your Honor, the United States

(703) 299-4599

```
| and the defendant agree that the United States would
1
  have proven the following facts at trial beyond a
3
  reasonable doubt with admissible and credible evidence:
 4
             Beginning in or around November 22 and
5
   continuing through in and around March 2024, in the
  Eastern District of Virginia and elsewhere, the
6
7
  defendant, Robert Wesley Robb, did knowingly devise and
  lintend to devise a scheme and artifice to defraud
8
   investors and to obtain money and property by means of
9
10
  materially false and fraudulent pretenses,
11
  representations, and promises and for the purpose of
12
  executing the scheme and artifice to defraud knowingly
13
   transmitted and caused to be transmitted by means of
14
  wire communications in interstate commerce certain
15
  \parallelwritings, signs, signals, and sounds, in violation of
16
  Title 18, United States Code, Section 1343.
             Specifically, on or about October 27, 2023,
17
18
   the defendant, using an electronic device located
19
  outside the Commonwealth of Virginia, transmitted a
20
  message via the Internet to Investor A, an
   individual --
21
22
        (Reporter clarification.)
23
             MS. BEDELL: -- to Investor A, an individual
2.4
  \parallellocated in the Eastern District of Virginia --
25
             I apologize. I will try to slow down.
```

On or around September 4, 2023, using an electronic device, Robb posted in his Friend. Tech chat using the Internet, advertising an opportunity to invest in a Maximum Extractable Value cryptocurrency trading bot. Robb invited individuals that had 100 to 200,000 plus sitting around and who wanted to participate in some next-level MEV stuff to send him a direct message to learn more. A screenshot containing Robb's representations on Friend. Tech is included in the statement of facts.

On or about September 7, 2023, Investor A sent a direct message to Robb's X account and discussed the opportunity to invest in the MEV bot.

Robb explained to Investor A how the MEV bot would work, how Investor A's investment would be used as capital by the MEV bot to trade cryptocurrency, i.e., not to fund Robb's personal expenses, and how the origin of Investor A's investment must be obfuscated and how Robb and Investor A would split profits.

Further, Robb described the MEV bot as capable of delivering very high returns and assured Investor A that this was a low-risk investment. Additionally, Robb insisted that Investor A must invest within a day or two because he expected the bot to be operational soon, like early next week. Screenshots reflecting

```
\parallelthese conversations are included within the statement
 2
   of facts.
 3
               On Telegram, Robb provided Investor A a
 4
   \parallelvirtual currency address to send his initial \$100,000
 5
   investment. On or about September 8, 2023, Robb
   sent -- Investor A sent to Robb approximately $100,000.
 7
   \parallelOn September 26 and 27 and October 2, the funds
   provided by Investor A were transferred into Robb's
 9
   Coinbase account from which he was then able to
10
   \paralleltransfer funds to his traditional bank account.
11
               In the days between September 8 and
12
   \parallelSeptember 26 and in the weeks and months that followed,
13
   Robb repeatedly promised Investor A that the MEV bot
14
   would be launched shortly and then subsequently
   provided multiple excuses for why the MEV bot had not
15
   yet launched. At no point did Robb reveal to
17
   ||Investor A that he had used Investor A's funds and/or
   other investors' funds to fund his personal expenses.
18
19
               On or about October 27, 2023, Robb told
20
   \|\mathsf{Investor}\ \mathsf{A}\ \mathsf{that}\ \mathsf{a}\ \mathsf{new}\ \mathsf{investor}\ \mathsf{was}\ \mathsf{interested}\ \mathsf{in}\ \mathsf{making}
21
   a $300,000 investment in the MEV bot. He told
22
   Investor A that such an investment would dilute
23
   \parallelInvestor A's profits, so he was giving Investor A the
   \parallelchance to make an additional investment in the MEV bot,
```

which he said would also insulate Investor A even

25

further by spreading out the small risk profile
associated with the bot. This was false because Robb
had already spent Investor A's previous investment on
personal expenses. So an additional investment would
not and could not dilute any profits or insulate
Investor A in any way. And further deposits from
Investor A would, at best, serve to replace funds Robb
had misused and thereby conceal Robb's misuse of
Investor A's initial investment.

Robb also told Investor A the MEV bot would launch in the next week or so.

On or about October 28, 2023, Investor A sent an additional \$50,000 to an Ethereum virtual currency address provided by Robb.

On or around November 8, 2023, Investor A requested a refund from Robb because they had not received any returns or evidence that Robb had created a MEV bot. Robb provided multiple excuses for why he could not immediately refund Investor A. Despite Robb repeatedly promising his refund by various dates, Investor A never received a refund from Robb, nor profits from the MEV bot.

The government's investigation identified more than ten investors in Robb's scheme alleging losses totaling more than \$2.2 million. The investor

complaints include allegations of misrepresentations, material omissions, and misuse of investor funds for personal expenses similar to the misrepresentations and omissions previously discussed.

The earliest reported complaint is from Investor B, who received a message from Robb in October 2022 seeking an investment. From in and around November 2022 to June 2023, Investor B invested a total of approximately \$514,000 with Robb. Through its own review of financial records and interviews with investors, the FBI has identified at least \$1.5 million in funds that is either confirmed or believed were from investors.

Despite Robb's representations to investors claiming investor funds will be used as trading capital for the MEV bot, the investor funds were funneled to virtual currency exchange accounts and traditional bank accounts held in Robb's name and not used as trading capital for the MEV bot.

Contrary to Robb's promises that the funds would be used to invest or otherwise in connection with the MEV bot, the vast majority of the funds were, in fact, used to pay for personal expenses, including airline tickets, vacations, gambling, cars, and other luxury items. Several examples of specific expenses

```
are included in the statement of facts.
1
2
             At no point before or after investors decided
3
  to send him money did Robb inform current or
4
  prospective investors that he used investors' money to
5
  fund personal expenses or that he would do so.
6
             This statement of facts includes only those
7
  \parallelfacts necessary to support the plea agreement and does
  Inot include every fact known to the defendant or the
  United States.
9
10
             THE COURT: Would you come to the podium,
11
  please, Mr. Robb.
12
             Do you disagree with anything the government
13
  has told the Court about your conduct?
14
             THE DEFENDANT: No, Your Honor.
15
             THE COURT: I understand you've also signed a
16
  written statement of facts. Is that correct?
17
             THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
18
             THE COURT: Do you have that document in
19
  front of you?
20
             THE DEFENDANT:
                              I do.
21
             THE COURT: Your signature appears on that
22
  document, and you signed that document; is that
23
   correct?
2.4
             THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.
25
             THE COURT: Did you read, understand, and
```

Rhonda F. Montgomery OCR-USDC/EDVA (703) 299-4599

```
have all your questions answered about that written
 1
   statement of facts?
 2
 3
             THE DEFENDANT:
 4
             THE COURT: Did anyone threaten you or try to
 5
   influence you in any way into signing that written
 6
   statement of facts against your will?
 7
             THE DEFENDANT: No, Your Honor.
 8
             THE COURT: Are the statements in that
 9
  written statement of facts true and correct?
10
             THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
11
             THE COURT: And is it your decision to enter
12
  \parallela quilty plea here today because you're, in fact,
13
  guilty of what you've been charged with?
14
             THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.
15
             THE COURT: Ms. Bedell, based on everything
16
  you know, is there an adequate basis for the plea in
17
  #this case?
18
             MS. BEDELL: Yes, Your Honor.
19
             THE COURT: Before pleading to the criminal
20
   information, would you like to speak with your lawyer
21
  any further?
22
             THE DEFENDANT: No, Your Honor.
23
             THE COURT: With respect to the charge of
  wire fraud, in violation of Title 18, United States
25
   Code, Section 1343, how do you plead? Guilty or not
```

```
guilty?
 1
 2
              THE DEFENDANT:
                              Guilty.
 3
              THE COURT:
                          Let the record reflect based on
 4
   the responses of this defendant to the Court's
 5
   questions, representations of counsel for the
   government and for the defendant, it's the finding of
 6
 7
   \parallelthis Court in the case of United States v. Robert
  Wesley Robb that the defendant is fully competent and
   capable of entering an informed plea, that the
   defendant is aware of the nature of the charges and the
10
11
   consequences of the plea, and that the plea of guilty
12
  \parallelis a knowing and voluntary plea supported by an
13
   independent basis in fact containing each of the
14
   essential elements of the offense. The plea is
15
   therefore accepted, and the defendant is now adjudged
  guilty of that offense.
17
              Ms. Robb, I'm not going to sentence you
18
   today. I'm going to set this matter down for
19
  sentencing on September 11 at 9:00 a.m. in this
20
   courtroom.
21
              Between now and then, you will have the
22
   opportunity to be interviewed by a representative of
23
   \parallelpretrial services and probation. That will be an
  \parallelopportunity for you to share with that office and,
25
   through that office, this Court any information you
```

```
Ithink will be helpful to the Court in deciding what an
1
   appropriate sentence is, and you may be accompanied by
2
3
  your lawyer during that interview.
 4
             All right. Why don't you have a seat for a
5
   Moment.
6
             MS. RIGBY: Your Honor, two things.
                                                   The
7
  \parallelparties would like to hand up the information to which
  Mr. Robb just pled quilty.
                                It has one change to the
9
   one submitted to chambers. So we wanted to make sure
  the correct one was filed.
10
11
             THE COURT: All right.
12
             MS. RIGBY: Just for the record, the only
13
   thing that was changed was that the forfeiture notice
14
  lincluded a specific reference to a stadium suite, and
15
   that's been removed.
16
             THE COURT: All right.
17
             MS. RIGBY: So with the assistance of the
18
   court security officer, I'll hand that up just to make
19
   sure the right one is filed.
20
             THE COURT: All right.
21
        (A document is passed up to the Court.)
22
             MS. RIGBY: Your Honor, having conferred with
23
   government counsel about their schedules, I would ask
2.4
  \parallelthe Court if a later date could be set only -- I have a
25
   very complicated tax sentencing that week --
```

```
1
             THE COURT: For the sentencing?
 2
             MS. RIGBY: Yes, Your Honor.
 3
             -- followed by a fraud one the next week.
4
   apologize.
5
             THE COURT: All right.
6
             MS. RIGBY: If there were any way to move it
7
   to October --
8
                          I could do it October 2.
             THE COURT:
9
             MS. RIGBY: I would make that work, Your
10
  Honor.
11
             THE COURT:
                         All right, October 2.
12
             MS. RIGBY:
                          Okay.
13
             THE COURT:
                         Mr. Robb, I've rescheduled the
14
  sentencing hearing for October 2.
15
             All right. The defendant has also filed a
  motion for release pending sentencing, essentially an
  \parallelappeal from Judge Fitzpatrick's detention order. I've
17
18
  reviewed the briefing.
19
             Ms. Rigby, do you want to represent anything
20
  further on this?
21
             MS. RIGBY: I do, Your Honor.
22
             THE COURT:
                         Yes.
23
             MS. RIGBY: First, I want to especially
  stress that some of the information in the government's
25
   opposition -- please let me know if the Court can't
```

Rhonda F. Montgomery OCR-USDC/EDVA (703) 299-4599

```
hear me. I wanted to address some of the new
1
  information in the government's opposition, Your Honor.
2
3
              THE COURT:
                          All right.
 4
              MS. RIGBY: As the Court knows, government
5
   counsel filed Exhibit 1. I want to stress this was not
   provided until after we filed the motion. I think the
6
7
  Court can tell from the exhibit itself that the
  \parallelinformation came in on June 20, the same date that I
8
  filed the motion.
9
10
              I had asked for the basis for the
11
  government's assertions earlier that Mr. Robb had made
  threats, and that is how I came to Exhibits 2 and 3 to
12
13
  \parallelmy motion and to my understanding of the scope of
14
   anything related or similar to threats.
15
              Government counsel had affirmed that they
16
  were not aware of any threats to other's physical
17
  safety at the time we spoke on June 20, I think.
18
  \parallelnow all of a sudden this comes in. Now, I just want to
19
  make sure that the Court understands I was not holding
20
  back on that, number one.
21
              THE COURT:
                          I understand.
22
             MS. RIGBY: And number two, Your Honor, I
23
  \parallelthink the timing of it is relevant to how much weight
2.4
  \parallelit should be given. I, frankly, think there's a good
25
   deal of reason to doubt what's in that email from this
```

```
witness. Number one, it's secondhand, and I think the government sort of acknowledges that by putting it in the footnote, right. So this witness is saying that another person told them that Mr. Robb had made a threat to kill this witness and his mother. So secondhand first of all.

Secondly, that the person allegedly reporting this, I will note for the Court, is a convicted felon. He has been convicted in federal court of uttering counterfeit securities. He's been convicted in state court of several fraudulent acts, such as passing bad checks. He's been trespassed from casinos. He's been sued. He's sued everybody else. He's been banned from casinos in at least one state that I know of,
```

I don't believe he claims to be a victim of this scheme, but he has been very intent on going after Mr. Robb and helping the government make their case, possibly to protect his own interests, Your Honor. We don't know.

Pennsylvania, and that's a public record, Your Honor.

So number one -- or I should say number two, the source of this is highly suspect. Secondly, the witness himself claims he heard this several months before Mr. Robb was arrested. I don't recall the exact date that this witness was interviewed by the FBI, but

```
he was interviewed by the FBI. It is very hard to believe that if he had what he considered a credible threat against his own life and his mother's that he did not report that until June 20, the day that Mr. Robb asked for release again. So I would ask the Court to take that into consideration.
```

And in the end -- again, he says this is several months before Mr. Robb was arrested. There is no evidence whatsoever that Mr. Robb actually took any step to act on any supposed threat to this witness or his mother or anybody else.

This witness also forwarded along a snippet of a text that he attributes to Mr. Robb. I don't know where it comes from. I don't know the context.

Mr. Robb does not specifically recall making it.

All of that, Your Honor, I think is reason to give it little weight. But the text itself, Your Honor, says -- I forgot what it says -- something about stomping on this person, who is the witness who sent that email in Exhibit 1, Your Honor.

He says he's going to do this LOL. I'm sure the Court is familiar that. That means "laugh out loud." So I think that suggests that it was not serious as does the fact that it does not seem to have been reported until June.

So coupled with the fact, again, Your Honor, that Mr. Robb has not taken any steps to actually try to harm anybody, I would ask the Court to give all of this sudden information very little weight.

Your Honor, the government also points to a jail call and says that Mr. Robb admitted on a recorded phone call he is now careful to not be so explicit, of course, referring to the fact that he was alleged to have made threats in the past.

I asked government counsel what call that was. I listened to it again today. The context is -first of all, that's not a quote at all. Secondly,
that call was Mr. Robb explaining to his sister that a
prosecutor in Nevada had said in court that he had
threatened people in this case, in this context
presuming. And he was very upset about it, and he was
strenuously denying that that's what he had done. It
was not in any way suggesting, as I think this
opposition does, "Hey, listen, don't worry. I'm
careful about how I make my physical threats." He was
saying, "I have not made any physical threats at all."
He said, "I was very careful. Ever since my

He said, "I was very careful. Ever since my last thing" -- referring to his old case -- "I have never threatened anyone." That's what he said, Your Honor. He was not suggesting that he's covering for --

he's not making veiled threats. He's denying that he makes physical threats against people.

And again, Your Honor, no matter what he said, no matter what he said in chats -- we all know we will say a lot of things online that we will not actually do. There's no evidence whatsoever that he's ever actually tried to harm anybody physically.

Second, Your Honor -- and I will move on -the conditions we propose would ensure he does not
present a threat to anybody, physically or otherwise.

The serious conduct, the government reiterates that he has pled guilty. We understand that. These are serious allegations. He's admitted that. All of that is true, but that's not the question before the Court. The question is whether he will be a danger or abscond before sentencing under the conditions we propose, and he will not be able to do that under the conditions we propose, Your Honor.

I understand he will be punished. He understands that. He's agreed to recommend a certain sentence. But until that time, he has a right to be at liberty if there are conditions that can ensure the safety of the community -- and we believe there are -- and that can assure he will reappear. We believe there are.

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

```
Really, the government has no response to the
evidence that since 2005, Mr. Robb has not violated any
conditions or to the fact that when he did violate
conditions when he was on supervised release 20 years
ago, which was a very long time ago, he wasn't under
any of the kind of conditions that we're proposing.
          No matter what the government can say about
\parallelhim -- they can say he has confessed to committing a
fraud recently. They can't say that there's evidence
\parallelof willful or of any violations of court orders in
going on 20 years.
          And, Your Honor, I just would -- I'm not
going to repeat everything in the motion. I know the
Court has read that.
          THE COURT: I have read it.
          MS. RIGBY:
                      Thank you, Your Honor.
          But the last thing I would say is that his
sister is a perfectly good third-party custodian.
did not ask for -- I don't know exactly where the
quotes come from where she's saying this is unfair,
this is ridiculous, or whatever she's saying.
say in the call I listened to again today where
Mr. Robb is upset about what's happening in the bond
hearings, she doesn't make comments like that.
          So I suspect -- I don't know -- that she may
```

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

```
have been responding to that, and I know that's been a
continuing concern for Mr. Robb. So very likely she's
been responding to that going on and that concern being
that he has been misrepresented as making physical
threats about people, which he denies.
           Further, Your Honor, sympathetic responses to
\parallelsomebody sitting in a jail cell does not mean that she
\parallelwill not abide by the Court's requirements of a
third-party custodian. Everything else about her
character suggests that she will.
           And if she is sympathetic to Mr. Robb, she
\parallelwill understand, as does he, that the best thing he can
do for himself is follow the conditions, show that he
can do that, come back to court, do no further harm,
and get the best sentence he can.
           And so, Your Honor, I think she's a perfectly
\parallelgood third-party custodian. I don't think these
sympathetic remarks should weigh heavily in the Court's
consideration.
           And for all the reasons in the motion, we do
ask that the Court release Mr. Robb.
           THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
           Ms. Bedell.
           MS. BEDELL: Your Honor, this is the
defendant's third attempt at release. As Judge
```

Fitzpatrick noted, the defendant's history, his pattern, the strength of the evidence all counseled in favor of keeping him detained. That was when the government had the burden. Since then, the only thing that has changed is that the burden has shifted and that Mr. Robb has now pled guilty to the charge.

We outline our key arguments in the brief, but there are a few points I wanted to elaborate on.

As we mentioned -- obviously, you're very familiar with the facts having just gone through the statement of facts. I mentioned in the brief that the fraud was ongoing at the time of his arrest. So he did not abandon his criminal conduct out of the goodness of his heart.

I also wanted to highlight that Mr. Robb at the time was beginning to solicit funds for a new investment. Now, the government hasn't been focused on this investment, but it did follow a lot of the patterns that we see in the present case, which was that he had made a lot of promises about how fast a new token would be coming out and how much money everyone could make. But the difference was until right at the end, he wasn't actually soliciting investments for that. So we do have significant concerns that he has multiple schemes going out there; though, again, that

has not been the focus of our investigation given the limited funds he solicited from investors to this point.

As you're aware, this is his third conviction. All of these prior convictions are for fraud. The magistrate judge in Nevada noted the similarity between the conduct at issue here and the conduct at issue in his past convictions except that the defendant was getting more sophisticated. There's no indication, Your Honor, that he has learned his lesson despite the time that has passed.

His prior experience on supervised release is also highly informative and has been a significant concern for both of the magistrates who hear this to date. Judge Fitzpatrick found a complete inability on willingness to comply with orders of the court in the past and an abysmal failure when he was on supervised release for the first time.

Now, he has not had a supervised release violation since 2005, but he, I think, only spent about six months on supervised release after being released from his second term of incarceration for the offense.

During his first unsuccessful period of supervised release, though, he left the district without approval. He did not notify his officer about

2.4

a change of residence. He failed to report to probation, and he absconded. Most notably, he committed his other fraud offense while on supervised release for his first fraud offense.

Since then, he has no stable employment. He has had limited other income, some of which is of questionable legitimacy. He had no stable home. He was hopping from casino to casino and gambling while being comped for hotel rooms. We believe he may still have access to vehicles and other assets that he could sell for cash.

I do want to address the threats as well.

Judge Fitzpatrick was correct in noting that Mr. Robb did make explicit threats to victims. This is similar to prior offenses. Now, at the time, neither the government nor Judge Fitzpatrick were aware of explicit threats of violence, and I don't believe that's what anyone's argument was about at the time. But the suggestion that these other threats were simply about a lawsuit or is really an incredible claim, Mr. Robb was acting erratically claiming that investors were conspiring to murder him. He told investors that he can, quote, track you even if they were trying to conceal their identity. And these are people operating online under monikers.

He says that he knows their names, that he knows where they live. He sent an investor his own address. When that happens, someone who is interacting with a convicted criminal who has stolen their money does not first think, oh, he must be trying to serve me a subpoena. That is, of course, not how the investors in this case understood those threats either.

One victim said that he believed Mr. Robb was, in fact, trying to intimidate him, and another victim understood these as a veiled threat. Again, that's just referring to the address and name and saying, "I know where you live and who you are."

Now, he did make explicit threats to sue investors. Frankly, the investors did not react with particular concern about those threats because, of course, the idea that the guy who is scamming you is going to sue you, it's not really the scariest threat. But they were concerned about his erratic behavior and his strange paranoia and the threats that were veiled threats about knowing where they live.

Since then, we have learned about this additional information, this threat from an investor -- excuse me, a threat received by an investor. Ms. Rigby is correct. We were speaking with a victim yesterday who was exercising his right to consult with the

2.4

government when he was learning about the plea and had questions. He mentioned that he was interested in the outcome of today's detention hearing because if Mr Robb was released, he was interested in seeking a restraining order. I asked what the basis for that concern was, and this is the email that we received detailing it.

So, you know, the threats on the investor and his mother's life, we don't have the direct proof for that. That is several layers of hearsay. But what it does do is explain some of the context in which the investors would have been hearing these threats.

I left this out when I read the statement of facts, but PokerBrat2019 is one of the defendant's acknowledged monikers that he used online. It's clear these texts come from that.

If you compare the background and the little symbol that's used for these texts, it's the same as in the statement of facts. So suddenly disclaiming -- I have no idea where these came from. Because I don't remember it, it means I must not have done it. That's simply not credible when this is supported by the statement of facts.

And do I believe that Mr. Robb was literally intending to curb-stomp an investor? No. I think

2.4

```
there was some degree of posturing there. But again, he is threatening violence, and that certainly provides the context for when he makes statements like, "We can track you. I can track you, and I know where you live."
```

I do also want to address the conditions of release. This is a crime, it's clear, that can be committed from home sitting in your sister's basement, and it's extremely easy for defendants, particularly sophisticated defendants, to procure devices.

I have a defendant who lives in rural Maine who keeps getting devices, and he hides them under a tree. We see this regularly with child exploitation defendants. Electronic monitoring is only after the fact and only works for devices that the government and probation knows about.

He has no meaningful ties to the community beyond his sister. He has not lived there. He doesn't seem to have any other meaningful relationships with his relatives there. And while his sister is no doubt a very nice person, she does appear to have fallen victim to Mr. Robb's, frankly, self delusion and his manipulative behavior.

When you listen to these jail calls, he is going on to anyone who will listen, including his

```
sister, about how everyone but him is responsible.
   the prosecutors are lying. He wasn't just upset that
  the prosecutors had accused him of making threats.
   was upset that they had lied because, of course, it had
5
   to be lie. He was upset that the FBI had been lying
  and the affidavit was full of lies. Everyone is out to
7
  \parallelruin his life. I can't remember if it was the
  prosecutors to be honest with the agents, but they're
  evil in carnet. At one point, he said, "Basically, I'm
10
  \parallelbeing persecuted for my last case 20 years ago.
11
  There's no evidence."
12
             And the sister falls for this.
                                              She believes
13
  he is the victim. This is so unfair. This is so
14
  unfair. I don't know why they're picking on you.
                                                      This
15
  is ridiculous. This is so unfair.
                                        It's so
16
  unbelievable. Why are you doing this to my brother?
17
  It's so wrong. It's not your fault.
                                          It's unfair.
18
  \parallelhad no problems in 16 years, and then all of a sudden
19
  they arrest you.
20
             It's clear that those messages are across two
21
  different days.
                   Those conversations are from two
22
  different days. It's not just reacting to allegations
23
  of threats. Now, I will say that Mr. Robb's
  brother-in-law does appear to be somewhat more
25
  skeptical of Mr. Robb's claims, but he is not home
```

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

```
\parallelduring the day. And I don't think that that is a
sufficient deterrent on supervision to ensure that he
does not access devices or otherwise pose a risk to the
community.
          Unless there are other questions, Your Honor,
I'll rest on our briefing.
           THE COURT: All right. Ms. Rigby.
          MS. RIGBY: Just a few brief responses, Your
Honor.
          First, I would ask the Court to consider not
|just what the magistrate judges found in two prior
proceedings but what is before the Court today.
are several things that are different today. The first
of those -- or I'd say one of the most important is
that the record is now more complete and clear than it
\parallelwas for either of those judges. In particular, with
regard to this threat issue.
          And second, although Mr. Robb fully
\parallelunderstands, his exposure is the same. The government
has now agreed to cap their recommendation.
course, is going to weigh on him just as it would if
there were not one. That's a fact of life. That's
very practical and true.
          Your Honor, in terms of whether he was
continuing anything up until the time of his arrest or
```

2.4

anything else that he did in the past, that was not when he was under the conditions that we're proposing.

I don't know what the facts were of these cases where this guy is hiding it under the tree. I don't know if he has a third-party custodian. I don't know if he has location monitoring. I don't know if the court banned devices altogether. We don't know any of the details of those cases. I'm not familiar with that many child exploitation defendants getting out on bond in the first place.

The question before the Court is would this particular third-party custodian in rural Nevada on seven acres far away from town -- she's an LDS member. She's going to be home all day long. Her husband is going to be home in the evening. She's going to lock up her devices. She's going to hold her keys. The question is under all of those circumstances, is Mr. Robb likely to reoffend or threaten anybody or do anything. Our position is he is not.

So I'm not going to address every single little thing. That is the issue: Can the conditions do the trick? We believe they can.

Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

The defendant has filed a motion for release

2.4

```
pending sentencing pursuant to Section 3143, essentially appealing the magistrate judge's decision to detain Mr. Robb. This proceeding is a de novo consideration of the evidence that's presented to the Court.
```

The one difference, obviously, is that the burden has shifted. Mr. Robb has now pled guilty, which from a sentencing perspective evidences an early acceptance of responsibility. But nevertheless, for the purposes of determining whether he should be released pending sentencing, it does shift the burden to the defendant to establish by clear and convincing evidence that he is not likely to flee or pose a danger to the safety of any other person or the community.

The Court has reviewed the record both before the magistrate judge and also as that record has changed or been expanded upon in this court. The Court has reviewed the defendant's submissions and its response to the evidence that was presented before the magistrate judge.

In determining whether or not the defendant has met his burden, the Court has considered an entire range of factors, including the defendant's own criminal history, his prior supervised release violations and revocation, his mental health issues

2.4

that have been put in the record, but also the disposition for any continued criminal activity and the extent to which the proposed conditions could effectively restrain any possible activity in that regard.

The Court has also considered the location of the proposed home confinement and the issues that may associate with that, as well as the defendant's connection to that. But more generally, the ability of any conditions to effectively restrain the defendant from engaging in any kinds of activity that would constitute a danger to the community or establish some ability on his part to not appear.

Without indicating whether or not the Court were to reach the same decision as the magistrate judge, the issue here is whether the evidence is clear and convincing. The Court simply can't conclude, based on this record, by clear and convincing evidence that the defendant is not likely to flee or pose a danger to the safety of any other person or the community based on the conditions proposed. Therefore, the Court is going to deny the motion. The defendant will remain detained pending sentencing.

Anything further?

MS. BEDELL: Nothing from the government,

```
Your Honor.
 1
 2
              MS. RIGBY: No, Your Honor.
 3
              THE COURT: All right. Counsel is excused.
              The defendant is remanded.
 4
 5
              The Court will stand in recess.
 6
                        Time: 3:22 p.m.
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
        I certify that the foregoing is a true and
22
    accurate transcription of my stenographic notes.
23
24
                                            /s/
25
                              Rhonda F. Montgomery, CCR, RPR
     Rhonda F. Montgomery OCR-USDC/EDVA (703) 299-4599
```